

## REMARKS

This paper is in response to the official action dated December 7, 2005. Claims 1 to 2, 4 to 15, and 17 to 28 are pending in the application; claims 3 and 16 are canceled. Claims 1 to 7 and 16 to 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,343,264 to Fenton (hereinafter "*Fenton*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,212 to Krinsky (hereinafter "*Krinsky*"). Further, claims 8 to 15 are similarly rejected as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,122,391 to Ringland (hereinafter "*Ringland*") in view of *Krinsky*. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following argument.

### I. § 103(a) Rejections

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Because neither *Fenton* nor *Ringland* in combination with *Krinsky* teaches or suggests claims 1, 8, 18, and 23 as amended, the rejection under § 103(a) is improper.

No combination of cited references discloses dividing and physically applying a decorative element to a window covering:

wherein the selection appears continuous across the first window covering section and the second window covering section when the window covering is in either an open position or a closed position. (emphasis added)

as currently claimed in claims 1, 8, 18, and 23. No combination of *Fenton* or *Ringland* and *Krinsky* discloses dividing the element across window covering sections so that the element appears continuous whether the covering is open or closed as claimed. *Krinsky*, teaching away from the claimed invention, discloses dividing a decorative element across wallpaper panels such that:

...a coherent visual image with a non-repeating pattern covers all six panels and each of the upper, middle, and lower sections of these panels to provide a complete picture (col 3, lines 38-41).

However, *Krinsky* discloses not using individual panels or portions of panels, yet maintaining some combination contiguous panels to produce a coherent image (col. 3, lines 47-57).

However, neither *Fenton* nor *Ringland* alone or in combination with *Krinsky* would produce a

coherent image when the window covering is in either an open position or a closed position as claimed in claims 1, 8, 18, and 23.

Neither *Fenton* nor *Ringland* alone or in combination with *Krinsky* discloses every element of claims 1, 8, 18, and 23. Accordingly, the cited elements are not taught or suggested and claims 1, 8, 18, and 23 and all claims dependent thereon, are allowable.

## II. Conclusion

The applicants submit the application as a whole is in a condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest opportunity. The examiner is encouraged to contact the applicants' undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this response or the application as a whole at the telephone numbers indicated below.

Dated: March 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony G. Sitko

Registration No.: 36,278

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant